

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/601,193 | 06/23/2003 | Jean-Guy Cocaign | 028811-25 6423 | |
| 22204 7 | 7590 04/23/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| NIXON PEABODY, LLP 401 9TH STREET, NW | | | MORROW, JASON S | |
| SUITE 900 WASINGTON, DC 20004-2128 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3612 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | [A | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Application No. 10/601,193 | Applicant(s) COCAIGN, JEAN-GUY | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Jason S. Morrow | 3612 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | | 1 | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | vn from consideration. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 23 June 2003 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | ☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/23/03. | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | | | | | |

Art Unit: 3612

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the louvers must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: In lines 1 and 2, the claims use the phrase "comprise comprises". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the side roof elements" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Application/Control Number: 10/601,193

Art Unit: 3612

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the inside surface of the glass" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohm et al. '864 in view of Clenet.

Bohm et al. discloses a roof module for closing an opening in a roof of a motor vehicle that extends transversely between two lateral roof elements (figure 2, 6) and in a lengthwise direction between a front roof element (figure 3, 6) and a rear roof element (figure 4, 6), and side roof elements, the front roof element and the rear roof element, the roof module comprising a glass pane (5) adapted for permanent connection to peripheral rabbets (shown in figure 2 as part of 6) which border the opening, a darkening device (17) which is deployable parallel to an inside surface of the glass pane, guide means (27) for guiding the darkening device, the guide means being permanently mounted on the inside surface of the glass pane along each of opposite side edges of the glass pane, the guide means interacting with edges of the darkening device, a support brace (38) mounted on the inside surface along one of front and rear transverse edges of the glass pane, the support brace having a motor drive (35) for driving the darkening device. The glass pane is adapted to be mounted on peripheral edges by cementing (using foam 3). Each

guide means is mounted by cementing on the inside surface of the glass pane (using foam 3). The support brace is mounted on the inside surface of the glass pane by cementing (using foam 9). The darkening device comprises a roll-up blind (17) which is permanently connected to the brace.

Bohm et al. does not disclose the front and rear roof element having a rabbet on edges that border the opening or the darkening device comprising louvers.

Bohm et al. does teach the use of peripheral rabbets on side elements (as seen in figure 2)

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify a roof module, such as that above, to be used on a vehicle having front and rear roof elements with rabbets since applicant has not disclosed that this particular feature solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears the device would perform equally well without the rabbets.

Clenet teaches the use of louvers (34).

It would have been an obvious matter or design choice to modify a darkening device, such as that disclosed by Bohm et al., to be comprised of louvers, as taught by Clenet, since applicant has not disclosed that this particular type of darkening device solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears the darkening device would perform equally well comprised of a sheet material.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Paetz et al., Ohkubo, Comert et al., Stallfort et al., de Gaillard, Bohm et al. '872, DE 019955710, and DE 10218601 all disclose vehicle roofs.

Application/Control Number: 10/601,193

Art Unit: 3612

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason S. Morrow whose telephone number is (703) 305-7803.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00a.m.-4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Dayoan can be reached on (703) 308-3102. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason S. Morrow

Page 5

Examiner

Art Unit 3612

April 13, 2004